

## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

GEORGE DOUGLAS SANDERS,

Civil No. 06-1557-AC

Petitioner

V. ORDER

BRIAN BELLEQUE

Respondent

MARSH, Judge.

Magistrate Judge John V. Acosta filed his Findings and Recommendation on December 30, 2008. The matter is now before me pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). When either party objects to any portion of the Magistrate's

Findings and Recommendation, the district court must make a de novo determination of that portion of the Magistrate's report.

See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C); McDonnell Douglas Corp. v.

Commodore Business Machines, Inc., 656 F.2d 1309, 1313 (9th Cir. 1981), cert. denied, 455 U.S. 920 (1982).

Petitioner has filed timely objections. I have, therefore, given the file of this case a de novo review.

I find no error. Accordingly, I ADOPT the Findings and Recommendation (#39) of Magistrate Judge Acosta. The First Amended Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (#29) is DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 22 day of January, 2009.

Malcolm F. Marsh

United States District Judge